| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Stuber, Robyn |
| **To:** | Webb, Steven J.@Waterboards |
| **Subject:** | RE: Hyperion |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, April 29, 2015 4:22:00 PM |

You're welcome. ☺

**ROBYN A. STUBER** ● (415) 972-3524
U.S. EPA REGION 9 ● NPDES PERMITS SECTION (WTR-2-3)
75 HAWTHORNE STREET ● SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

**From:** Webb, Steven J.@Waterboards [mailto:Steven.Webb@Waterboards.ca.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2015 2:21 PM
**To:** Stuber, Robyn
**Subject:** RE: Hyperion

Thank you! That helps a lot! So it looks like the IWC in the MRP for the one-mile outfall is incorrect. I will let the City of LA know that the limits specified in the permit are correct; however, the IWC for the one-mile outfall is incorrect in the MRP.

**From:** Stuber, Robyn [mailto:Stuber.Robyn@epa.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2015 1:54 PM
**To:** Webb, Steven J.@Waterboards
**Cc:** Morris, Cris@Waterboards
**Subject:** Hyperion

Hi Steven,

I reviewed a 1981 technical review report for the City's 301(h) application. It confirms to me that for 002, Dm = 84 and Sa = 85. This comports with the 1987 permit which describes the dilutions for 002 = 84+1:1 and 001 = 13+1:1. That said, the 1987 permit incorrectly calculates the daily maximum chronic toxicity WQBEL as 94.5 TUc. The permit did not specify an IWC with this WQBEL.

The 1994 permit sets daily maximum chronic toxicity WQBELs of 13 TUc for outfall 001 and 84 TUc for 002. The permit did not specify IWCs with these WQBELs.

The 2005 permit footnotes both chronic toxicity WQBELs saying that while they are miscalculated in the 1994 permit, they will be maintained in the 2005 permit because of antibacksliding (page 35, footnote 21). The MRP (page T-30) specifies incorrect IWCs for all the permit's chronic and acute toxicity WQBELs.

The 2010 order carries forward the 1994/2005 chronic toxicity WQBELs and the 2005 acute toxicity WQBEL. The MPR specifies incorrect IWCs for all toxicity WQBELs.

For this round of the permit, I recommend the following for chronic toxicity:
001 – Chronic toxicity MDEL "pass" in units of the TST and IWC of 7.69% effluent.
002 – Chronic toxicity MDEL "pass" in units of the TST and IWC of 1.19% effluent.

For 002, the acute toxicity IWC should be corrected from 35.7% effluent in the 2010 permit, to 35.71% in this round of the permit, that is, if you continue to include an acute toxicity WQBEL. What does the acute toxicity effluent data show for 002? Is there RP for acute toxicity for this discharge point?

Sorry if any of this repeats what you've already researched, but at least you'll be able to review my underlying rational. Call if you have questions.

Thanks,
Robyn

**ROBYN A. STUBER** ● (415) 972-3524
U.S. EPA REGION 9 ● NPDES PERMITS SECTION (WTR-2-3)
75 HAWTHORNE STREET ● SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

---

**From:** Webb, Steven J.@Waterboards [mailto:Steven.Webb@Waterboards.ca.gov]
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 28, 2015 3:55 PM
**To:** Stuber, Robyn
**Subject:** FW: Letter Clarifying MRP Hyperion Permit

Hi Robyn –

Here's the permit correction to the MRP for Hyperion's permit. The IWCs were not calculated in the same way for the two outfalls. If the IWC is 1/TUc limit, then the 1-mile outfall should be 1/13 = 7.69%, not 7.1%. After reading over your last e-mail, the difference in the IWC calculations may actually be appropriate because the dilution is less than 30:1 for the 1-mile outfall. Is this why the IWC was calculated adding one to the dilution credit? Should the effluent limit be 14 instead of 13? I would like to make a correction to the MRP or the WDR to make it consistent depending on what you believe is is appropriate.

Thank you!

***Steven Webb***
*Water Resource Control Engineer*
*Regional Water Quality Control Board*
*320 W 4th Street, Suite 200*
*Los Angeles, CA 90013*
*(213) 576-6793*
*Steven.Webb@Waterboards.ca.gov*